



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,413	09/25/2003	Kamil Mostafa Hajji	02-1006	9388

7590 12/02/2005

Leonard C. Suchyta
c/o Christian Andersen
Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.
600 Hidden Ridge, HQE03H01
Irving, TX 75038

EXAMINER

DEANE JR, WILLIAM J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Supplemental
Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,413

Applicant(s)

HAJJI ET AL

Examiner

William J. Deane

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2003 & phone call of 25Nov.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1 page.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

In response to applicant's telephone call on November 28, 2005, regarding the last Office action, the following corrective action is taken.

The period for reply of 3 MONTHS set in said Office Action is restarted to begin with the mailing date of this letter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 - 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0114437 (Nabkel et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,403 (Gerszberg et al.).

With respect to claims 1, 11, 14 -19, 25 and 27 – 30, note that Nabkel et al. teach a telephone system which provides an automated voice interface (note announcement device in Fig. 1), permitting the user to verbally specify an object corresponding to predefined objectives (paragraphs 0008 and 0011) including directory assistance (paragraph 0012) and the node acts to implement the object (the above and 0022). Note also paragraphs 0020 and 0032 of Nabkel. As shown above Nabkel et al. teach the claimed limitations except for after receiving the information desired conducting further action such as connecting a call to a third party. However, note that Gerszberg et al. teach an information or directory service that after receiving enough information can present the information, such as a requested phone number and

Art Unit: 2642

automatically connect the caller to a third party (see Col. 23, lines 4 – 54 of Gerszberg et al.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated such a platform as taught by Gerszberg into the Nabkel et al. device as such would only entail the substitution of one known service platform for another.

With respect to claims 2 and 20, note the above and Abstract of Nabkel et al.

With respect to claims 4 – 5, 7 and 22 - 23, note Fig. 4 and paragraphs 0018 and 0030 of Nabkel et al.

With respect to claims 3, 6 and 21, such would be inherent in a wireless system and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to migrate that which is known in wireline to wireless (again, note paragraph 0018).

With respect to claim 8, such a limitation would be inherent in an AIN system.

With respect to claim 9, such verification is inherent unless the service is free which is not the way business is done.

With respect to claims 10 and 24 note paragraph 0030 of Nabkel et al.

With respect to claims 12 and 26, note paragraph 0026 of Nabkel et al.

With respect to claim 13, note 0028 of Nabkel et al.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent No. 6,373,817 (Kung et al.) – note Figs. and Abstract;

U.S. Patent No. 6,400,804 (Bilder) - note Figs. and Abstract;

U.S. Patent No. 5,222,120 (Mcleod et al.) - note Figs. and Abstract;


U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0161464 (Rodriguez et al.) - note Figs. and
Abstract;

U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0108184 (Brown et al.) - note Figs. and
Abstract; and

U.S. Patent Application no. 2001/0012335 (Kaufman et al.) - note Figs. and
Abstract.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Bill Deane whose telephone number is (571) 272-7484.
In addition, facsimile transmissions should be directed to Bill Deane at facsimile number
(571) 273-8300.

29Nov2005


WILLIAM J. DEANE, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER